

REMARKS

The Office Action mailed February 25, 2009 noted that claims 1-16 were pending and rejected all claims. No claims are amended. No claims are cancelled. New claims 17 and 18 are added. No new matter is believed to be added.

Claims 1-18 are pending and under consideration. Reconsideration of the claims is respectfully requested. The rejection is traversed below.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Office Action, on page 3, rejected claims 1-16 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Isensee (U.S. Patent Number 5,734,805) in view of Komerska (Haptic Task Constraints for 3D Interaction). This rejection is respectfully traversed below.

Isensee discusses a first and second image. Clicking on a directional arrow in a second image having four directional arrows causes the first image to turn in any of four directions. This could cause, for example, a front elevation view of a house to rotate to a side elevation, or changing an image depicting a front façade of a house to a vehicle parked in a driveway adjacent to the house. Figure 5 of Isensee depicts a visual component control having a third dimension, which can change an image depicting a front elevation of a house to a top plan view or a bottom plan view. (See Isensee, column 5, lines 20-42, line 63 – column 6, line 7, Figure 9). The Office Action, on page 3, admits that Isensee does not specifically teach that the widget itself or where the view controls rotate correspond to the change in the display orientation. The Office Action, however, asserts that Komerska teaches this feature in Figures 3 and 4 of Komerska.

In light of the above discussion, it is respectfully submitted that nothing cited or found in Isensee teaches “a three-dimensional orientation indicator widget positioned in and displayed in association with a three-dimensional scene and **visually indicating an orientation of the scene.**” All figures in Isensee do not indicate the current orientation of the scene, but simply allow a user to turn an image in a direction and make a best guess as to what the desired final orientation is. Thus, a user cannot easily know what the current orientation of the scene is without looking at the scene or making a guess. While this may not be very difficult in relation to a house, other scenes are much more difficult. These other scenes in which a current orientation is nearly impossible to deduce from a current view especially after a number of rotations, translations, or tumbles make “a three-dimensional orientation indicator...visually indicating an orientation of the scene” imperative and make the current orientation always

visually available and visually obvious. Thus, Isensee does not teach “a three-dimensional orientation indicator widget...visually indicating an orientation of the scene.” The position indicator 21 of Isensee only indicates the current two-dimensional perspective of four total options, but a perspective is markedly different from an orientation of a scene, which as depicted throughout the application at various different degrees of orientation on three separate axes. Nothing cited or found in Komerska teaches this feature.

Furthermore, Komerska does not teach “the view controls rotate corresponding to the change in the display view orientation.” In the Office Action mailed July 25, 2008, on page 4, it was admitted that Komerska does not specifically mention more than yaw, pitch, and scale controls, but such an admission is absent from the current Office Action. Notably missing is a third dimension of rotation of the view controls corresponding to the change in the display view orientation, for instance, roll. Komerska does not indicate a third type of control of the view of the scene other than scale, and scale is very different from roll. (See Komerska, 5.1 Scene Navigation and Figures 3 and 4). For this reason and the reasons discussed above, claim 1 patentably distinguishes over Isensee and Komerska, taken alone or in combination.

Thus claim 1 patentably distinguishes over Isensee and Komerska, taken alone or in combination.

Independent claim 12 patentably distinguishes over Isensee and Komerska, taken alone or in combination, because nothing found or cited teaches “a three-dimensional orientation indicator positioned in **and indicating the orientation of the scene**” and “the view controls rotate corresponding to the change in the display view orientation.”

Independent claim 13 patentably distinguishes over Isensee and Komerska, taken alone or in combination, because nothing found or cited teaches “a view direction indicating control of **a three-dimensional orientation indicator** positioned in a display view of a three-dimensional scene” and “the view control rotates corresponding to the change in the display view orientation.”

Independent claim 14 patentably distinguishes over Isensee and Komerska, taken alone or in combination, because nothing found or cited teaches “three-dimensional directional indicators positioned in and displayed in association with **and indicating an orientation of a three-dimensional scene**” and “the indicator rotates corresponding to the change in the view.”

Independent claim 15 patentably distinguishes over Isensee and Komerska, taken alone or in combination, because nothing found or cited teaches “a three-dimensional orientation indicator positioned and displayed in association with in a three-dimensional scene, **visually**

indicating an orientation of the scene” and “where the view controls rotate corresponding to the change in the display view orientation.”

Independent claim 16 patentably distinguishes over Isensee and Komerska, taken alone or in combination, because nothing found or cited teaches “displaying a 3D scene and a 3D orientation indicator in association with the scene, **the indicator visually indicating an orientation of associated scene** and rotating in correspondence to scene view rotation.”

The dependent claims depend from the above-discussed independent claims and are patentable over Isensee and Komerska for the reasons discussed above. The dependent claims also recite additional features not taught or suggested by Isensee and Komerska. For example, claim 11 recites “fitting the scene object to the display view.” In particular, Isensee and Komerska do not teach fitting the scene object to the display view. Although the Office Action cites column 5, line 22 – column 6, line 7 of Isensee, nothing discusses such a feature. It is submitted that the dependent claims are independently patentable over Isensee and Komerska.

Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

New Claims 17 and 18

New dependent claim 17 patentably distinguishes over Isensee and Komerska taken alone and in combination, because nothing cited or found teaches “the three-dimensional orientation indicator visually indicates orientation of an x, y, and z axis in relation to the scene.”

New dependent claim 18 patentably distinguishes over Isensee and Komerska taken alone and in combination, because nothing cited or found teaches “the three-dimensional orientation indicator visually indicates top, bottom, left, right, front, and back in relation to the scene.”

Summary

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

Serial No. 10/627,974

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: 5-26-09

By: John R. Bednarz
John R. Bednarz
Registration No. 62,168

1201 New York Avenue, N.W., 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501